DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 198 702 FL 012 026

AUTHOR Ingram, D. E.
TITLE The Future of Community Languages in Australia.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 45p.: Paper presented at the Panaustralian Conference on Modern Greek Studies (6th, Adelaide, Australia, August 29-31, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cross Cultural Training: Educational Needs: Educational Policy: *Multicultural Education: *Second Language Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the role of languages in multicultural education in Australia. Despite numerous supportive statements, the reality is shcwn to be that the teaching of community languages has not significantly increased Australia-wide and that the language teaching system has not significantly changed to meet the new needs. It is shown that multicultural education based solely around culture teaching must fail, that language le rning mvst be seen as an essential part of culture teaching, and that it is the principal component of the education system that m st successfully meets the needs of multicultural education, especially in the area of favorable cross-cultural attitude development. If language teaching is tc meet these needs, it must be re-thought. Reference is made to some of the ways in which methodology must be changed to develop worthwhile skills and to effect favorable attitude change. Consideration is given to the proposition that a moratorium should be placed on further educational developments for multiculturalism and the suggestion that the "fad" of multiculturalism of the 1970s should be allowed to pass. Such views are shown to be wholly unacceptable. Rather than allowing the emphasis on multiculturalism to decline, what is required is that policies and their implementation be thought out more raticnally and systematically. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED198702

THE FUTURE OF COMMUNITY LANGUAGES IN AUSTRALIA

D.E. Ingram
Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education,
Brisbane.

FL 012 026

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. E. Ingram

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper to the Sixth Panaustralian Conference on Modern Greek Studies, Adelaide College of the Arts and Educacion (City Campus), August 29th-31st, 1980.

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at the role of languages in multicultural education as it has been developing in Australia. Despite the numerous supportive statements, the reality is shown to be that the teaching of the community languages has not significantly increased Australia-wide and that the language teaching system has not significantly changed to meet the new needs. It is shown that multicultural education based solely around culture teaching must fail, that language learning must be seen as an essential part of culture teaching, and that it is the principal component of the education system that most successfully meets the needs of multicultural education, especially in the area of favourable cross-cultural attitude development. Nevertheless, if language teaching is to meet these needs, it must be re-thought. Reference is made to some of the ways in which methodology must be changed to develop worthwhile skills and to effect favourable attitude change. Finally the paper considers the proposition that has been put forward that a moratorium should be placed on further educational developments for multiculturalism and the suggestion that the "fad" of multiculturalism of the 1970's should be allowed to pass. While such views may be the subject of abstract discussion, they are shown to be wholly unacceptable. Rather than allowing the emphasis on multiculturalism to decline, what is required is that policies and their implementation be thought out more rationally and systematically.

I. Introduction:

Undoubtedly, the most significant social development in Australia in the 1970's was the official recognition accorded to the multicultural and multilingual nature of Australian society. Fifteen years ago, Australia was fighting a war justified, at least in part, by racist "Yellow Peril" fears. Twenty-five years ago, the then ACTU President, Albert Monk, was able to observe:

> One of the first causes of friction we encounter is the fear that the presence of foreigners will undermine our own way of life. And Australian men and women... are not reassured by hearing foreign languages spoken in public places.
>
> (Quoted in Bostock, 1973:41)

Thirty years ago, the Prime Minister of the day described the social structure sought as

> ...the ideal of one Australian family devoid of foreign communities, thus preserving our homogeneity and solidarity as a nation.
>
> (Quoted in Martin 1972:14)

In contrast, today, every major political party in Australia has a policy favourable to the notion of multiculturalism, every State or Federal education authority has a policy endorsing multicultural education, and there have been numerous reports from government-sponsored committees or enquiries supporting a policy of multiculturalism and of community language teaching. These can be exemplified by the Galbally Report (1978) which stated as one of its "Guiding Principles":

> every person should be able to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage and should be encouraged to understand and embrace other cultures.
> (Galbally Report, 1978:4)

In the chapter on multiculturalism, the Report states:

> We are convinced that migrants have the right to maintain their cultural and racial identity and that it is clearly in the best interests of our nation that they should be encouraged and assisted to do so if they wish ...
>
> We reject the argument that cultural diversity necessarily creates divisiveness...
>
> We perceive many benefits arising from a multicultural society. Already our nation has been enriched by the artistic, intellectual and other attributes of migrant cultures ...
>
> ... We are of the opinion .. that the cultural and racial differences which exist among us must be reflected in educational programs designed to foster intercultural and interracial understanding.
> (Galbally Report, 1977:104-5)

Similarly, the *Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools* (Department of Education, 1976) recommended that the teaching of the community languages and cultures be expanded in

both Primary and Secondary Schools, stating, for example:

> All children should be given the opportunity to acquire an understanding of other languages and cultures from the earliest years of primary school.
>
> Particularly for migrant children entering school with an inadequate knowledge of English, there are strong educational and social reasons for continuing the learning of their own language...
>
> (Department of Education, 1976:35)

Similarly, the Schools Commission (1978:104-105), in its *Report for the Triennium 1979-81*, "fully endorses" the recommendation of the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council (1977) that Australia be regarded as a multicultural society in which all people have the right to maintain and preserve their language and culture, that bilingual education be expanded, and that schools be encouraged to develop the teaching of community languages. Similarly, government committees have advocated expanding Asian language teaching (Commonwealth Advisory Committee, 1970:90, 99) and recent public opinion polls (including one conducted in 1979 by students of Mount Gravatt C.A.E. (Ingram, 1980)) have shown strong public support for second language teaching in schools. A Morgan Poll published in June, 1978 showed that 90% of Australians thought a "foreign language" should be taught (*The Bulletin*, June 6th, 1978:25) while a Gallup Poll in May, 1977 found 49% asking for a second language to be compulsory (*The Courier Mail*, May 3rd, 1977:28).

Of all the statements, the Galbally Report has, undoubtedly, most significantly influenced Federal and State government policies. Yet, its failure to provide an overall perspective on Australian society means that most, though not all, its recommendations relate, in the area of education, to *migrant* education. However, the implications of multiculturalism impinge on all Australians and, if multiculturalism is to be viable, its implications must be realized in programmes that directly affect the teaching of all Australians. The Migrant Languages Report stated, "Intercultural studies should be part of every child's education..." (Department of Education, 1976:35). In other words, intercultural education, including community language teaching, must be seen as relevant not only to native speakers or the children of native speakers but to all Australians. While this is implied in the Galbally Report and is stated in the Migrant Languages Report it requires much more emphasis than is reflected in educational practice around Australia.

II. The Present Situation[1]*:*

Despite the professed support for multiculturalism and community language teaching, despite, it could be said, the many pious and idealistic words, the reality is that the education system for the vast majority of Australians remains at least as ethnocentric and materialistic as ever. Few schools, except some Primary Schools in the areas of greatest migrant density, have made more than token gestures towards multiculturalism. It will be argued later that, as the reports referred to earlier suggest, multiculturalism is inseparable from multilingualism and the principal element in the school curriculum answering the needs of multiculturalism is language teaching. Yet, contrary to what one would expect if the concept of multiculturalism seriously influenced policy implementation, enrolments in language classes around Australia continue to decline.

In Western Australia, despite an increase in total government secondary school enrolments of 18,732 from 1968 to 1980, language enrolments rose only 634. In fact, the proportion of secondary students taking a language declined 6.1% from the low 24.7% in 1968 to 18.6% in 1980. The greatest decline was in French (down 37.2%) and, although in percentage terms the other languages (German, Italian, Indonesian and Japanese) increased quite dramatically (61%, 778%, 179% and 2441% respectively), their numerical increases were quite small.

In Victoria, both the number of schools offering a language and the number of languages offered have recently increased. Nevertheless, enrolments are far from satisfactory with only 13.8% of HSC students studying a language in 1978, a slight increase of 2.3% from 1974 but still 2.1% fewer than in 1969. If the community languages are excluded from these figures on the grounds that their small numbers suggest that they are probably taken mainly by native speakers, then it emerges that, at best, 8.8% of HSC "non-migrant" candidates took a language. In Victoria, the most multicultural of all States, it is clear that few children experience significant second language learning and multicultural education remains largely chimeric.

In Tasmania, the proportion of students studying a language declined by 2.9% from 1975 to 1980 with French declining 25.2% and German 2.7% while Indonesian (143.4%), Italian (207.1%) and Japanese (60.5%) rose quite dramatically though their actual numbers remained very small. Overall, in 1980, 31.8% are shown as studying a language.

The figures the A.C.T. supplied do not reveal the direction in which language enrolments are moving though, for a small system, it is pleasing to note a healthy diversity of languages embracing French (27 Primary or Secondary Schools), German (24), Japanese (6),

Spanish (5), Latin (6), Greek (3), Indonesian (10), Aboriginal (2), Russian (1), and Italian (6).

In Queensland, the languages offered in the Secondary School have remained effectively unchanged for many years though Chinese was introduced to one private school three years ago and one school has introduced Greek in an after-hours "link" class catering for students from several nearby schools. Overall, enrolments continue their serious decline, Grade 10 dropping from 48.3% of total enrolments in 1971 to 26.8% in 1978 and Grade 12 from 33.1% in 1973 to 14.3% in 1978. Though French and German have suffered most in this period (50.2% and 25.7% reduction respectively), they retain (as in other States) the numerically largest enrolments since the actual increases in the other significant languages (Italian, Japanese, and Indonesian) are very small.

The only State which language teachers can contemplate with any optimism is South Australia. Unfortunately, changes in the ways in which languages are offered and statistics gathered make the South Australian figures difficult to interpret. Nevertheless, general trends are evident and the situation here is more promising than elsewhere. It cannot be coincidental that it is in South Australia that the most serious attempts at formulating and implementing positive language learning policies have taken place. Unlike other States, a continual increase in Grade 8 and 9 enrolments is seen from 1975 to 1979, Grade 8 language numbers increasing from 59.7% of total enrolment in 1975 to 71.6% in 1979 and Grade 9 from 27% to 38.7%. Nevertheless, disturbing factors remain: in particular, there is, first, a dropout rate of 32.8% from Grades 8 to 9 and 10% between subsequent years and, second, above Grade 8 only slightly more than 20% of students take a language. This last figure is little better than elsewhere and is especially regrettable when one realises that

it means that few of the learners who commence a language in Grade 8 will attain a practically useful level of proficiency before dropping it.

It is clear from this survey of language teaching around Australia that the idealistic policies in support of multiculturalism have not been realised in school and classroom practices. One must remain sceptical about the sincerity of policy-makers who espouse high ideals, utter mollifying clichés about community languages, and yet clearly fail to realise these incipient policies in practices that will ensure that a significant proportion of learners experience another language and culture.

However, some people may want to argue that multiculturalism does not need to entail language teaching and, in fact, there is evidence that educational policy-makers, in practice, reject language learning and wish to hinge "multicultural education" around culture teaching. Recently, an accreditation committee of the Board of Teacher Education in Queensland attacked a proposal for a Graduate Diploma in Multicultural Education at Mount Gravatt C.A.E. on the grounds that language and second language teaching were, at best, peripheral to multiculturalism. Although Queensland was the first State to officially adopt a multicultural education policy, the working party that drew up that policy advocated only the continuation of present Secondary School language programmes (despite their degenerate state and the virtual non-existence of community languages). The Working Party specifically recommended against the teaching of languages in the Primary School except in the form of fragmentary linguistic oddities (Working Party on Multicultural Education, 1978:Pars. 4.7, 4.8) and, in fact, a multicultural unit being trialled in State Primary Schools specifically excludes language learning. Similarly,

Bullivant (1979), in a major commissioned report for the Educational Research and Development Committee seems to discount any role for language teaching in multicultural education and the Curriculum Development Centre in its recent "core curriculum" proposals excluded languages from the core (see *The Age* and *The Australian* for June 25th, 1980).

A corollary of this language-less view of multicultural education is, in most cases, a view of culture as knowledge. In other words, it is implied or overtly stated that, in catering for the educational and attitudinal needs that arise in a multicultural society, all that is necessary in order to provide the requisite understanding and attitudes is that students be given factual information about other cultures. This view requires careful analysis and we shall consider, first, whether a knowledge-based definition of culture is, itself, adequate and, second, whether language teaching has a role in meeting the educational needs of a multicultural society.

III. Culture, Knowledge and Attitudes:

Bullivant defines the culture of a society as:

> ... the knowledge and conceptions it has evolved from the past and progressively modifies and augments to give meaning to and cope with the present and anticipated future problems of its existence.
> (Bullivant, 1979:2)

Undoubtedly, knowledge does have a role to play in attitudinal development and in cultural understanding. If one does not know anything of the culture of the other people, its constraints and presuppositions, then misunderstandings are more likely to arise and the 1975 UNESCO-FIPLV symposium called for both migrant and host

groups to be given detailed information about the other group in order to obviate misunderstanding (Johansson, 1975:6). The essence of a culture is the set of beliefs, customs, and ways of looking at the world which determine how a person will act (cf. Kleinjans, 1972:17; cf. Kelly's personal construct theory in Peck and Whitlow, 1975:47). Understanding a culture clearly requires at least that one knows what these are and, granted such knowledge, it is more likely that others' behaviour and ideas will be understandable and less likely that one will respond to and judge them according to one's own, inappropriate criteria. At least, the learner is more likely to recognise that there are other ways than his own of organising and judging the world and, provided his own personality and identity are secure, this is likely to make him more flexible, tolerant, broadminded, and appreciative of other values (cf. Johansson, 1975:8, 9).

However, a knowledge-based definition of culture is unduly restricted and prompts an inadequate approach to culture transmission and culture teaching. First, an adequate definition of "culture" must include not only knowledge in the narrowest sense but also the people's characteristic values, attitudes, feelings, assumptions, and ways of living, behaving, reacting and expressing themselves. Second, defining culture solely in terms of knowledge not inevitably but frequently seems to lead to a contrastive approach to culture teaching, i.e., to an approach that highlights the differences between cultures rather than their similarities. The evidence, however, suggests that such an approach, rather than lead to the desired goals of cross-cultural understanding and more favourable cross-cultural attitudes, actually has the opposite effect. Tuttle et al. (1979), for example, found in parallel studies that the group in which simi-

larities of life styles with Puerto Ricans were stressed became significantly less ethnocentric while no favourable change occurred where differences were stressed. Furthermore, even if culture transmission could be based on the teaching of cultural facts, culture teaching in the context of multiculturalism must be seen to have a further role, viz., the development of understanding and of more favourable cross-cultural attitudes. It is this role, especially in its relevance to community language teaching, which I now wish to consider.

III.1 Goal : To accept and not just to know

First, it should be observed that knowing about a people is different from knowing and understanding them and knowledge of a culture is not enough to ensure favourable attitudes (cf. Kleinjans, 1972:16). Savignon (1972:56, 58), in a study of adult second language learners, found no evidence that systematic culture teaching affected ethnocentrism though language learning did. Freire (1970: 23-24, 40, 55) believes that "humanizing education" involves not the in-pouring of knowledge but the realisation by the learners of the real nature of society, their rejection of the dehumanizing processes in it, and their acting to correct them. Where the dehumanizing processes involve the destruction of a person's or a group's individuality through the suppression of his language and culture by the dominant culture in a pluralist society, humanization involves one's accepting cultural and linguistic differences and actively trying to eradicate the social injustices (cf. Freire, 1970a:20-21). It involves not only being aware of differences but accepting and valuing them with one's own language and culture as expressions of universal humanity (cf. Adler, 1974:30; Jarvis, 1976:243-244). At the same time, it involves recognising the limitations and effects that

cultural boundaries impose and the inappropriate affective and normative responses they lead one to make (cf. Trifonovitch, 1973:38; Kleinjans, 1972:10). It involves perceiving, accepting, and valuing diversity within a human (and national and international) unity (cf. Milner, 1975:51).

Clearly, this implies that knowledge, though a factor in attitudinal development and cross-cultural understanding is insufficient by itself; a significant affective element is also required. Freire (1970:21) says that "the process of men's orientation in the world" must unite subjectivity and objectivity since reality is not only concrete facts but also man's perception of them (1970:31). Elsewhere, he says (1970a:27) that to deny subjectivity in transforming the world is to propound a world without men. The French philosopher-writer, Saint-Exupéry, makes essentially the same point in *Le Petit Prince* in an equally perceptive, if less academic, statement:

> Il est très simple : on ne voit bien qu'avec le coeur. L'essentiel est invisible pour les yeux.
> (Saint-Exupéry, 1958:72)

Thus, any discussion of basic human relationships (such as attitudes involve) which neglects the emotions or strives for total objectivity is necessarily inadequate in that it omits the very basis of relationships and of human experience. In fact, Milner (1975:54-55) cites several studies which show that knowledge is by no means an essential pre-requisite to the development of "emotional reactions to other nations" and, in any case, hate and prejudice can exist despite knowledge (cf. Kleinjans, 1972:26). In a multicultural society, furthermore, any theory which places knowledge or cognition as pre-requisite to attitudes, poses an impossible task since the sheer diversity of cultures precludes any person from fully understanding all the other

cultures. Rather, in a society such as Australia, what is important is that the individual learn to accept and tolerate even those cultural differences he does not understand.

Furthermore, in developing cross-cultural understanding, it is essential for each person to realise that not only do individuals within a cultural group differ but also that no individual views the world always in the same way but rather that people are influenced by moods and activities. Unless the learner realises this of himself and of others, he cannot understand or accept others as real human beings. Knowledge and acceptance of this human variability can come only as the learner experiences the reality of other people as he interacts with them in diverse situations (cf. Milner, 1975:46). Knowledge gained only through formal culture teaching is, therefore, in danger of stereotyping and dehumanizing the other people (cf. Freire, 1970a:43) but knowledge gained through interaction, through acting to change society, and through re-assessing one's own values and one's own perception of the world (i.e., through praxis (1970a: 28)), will humanize oneself and others and is more likely to favourably modify attitudes (cf. Freire, 1970:34). Fostering such interaction is , we shall see, a primary objective for second language teaching.

III.2 Sensitivity and Universality in Diversity

We have seen that, of itself, culture learning does not necessarily decrease ethnocentrism (Savignon, 1972:18). If ethnocentrism is to be decreased, culture learning must be structured to lead to an appreciation of the other people, not as stereotypes or virtual museum specimens, but as recognisable human beings with fundamentally the same potentialities, needs, and emotions that are, nevertheless, expressed in different ways. That is, the learner must come to

appreciate cultural diversity at the same time as he perceives universal humanity (cf. Tucker and Lambert, 1972:29). Freire explains how study of one culture, considered as an expression of universal humanity, can affect cross-cultural attitudes in general when he states:

> Existential experience is a whole. In illuminating one of its angles and perceiving the interrelation between that angle and others, the learners tend to replace a fragmented vision of reality with a total vision... (It) involves the learners in a constant reconstruction of their former ... (model) of reality.
> (Freire, 1970:33-34)

An approach to culture teaching which starts with this view of cultural diversity will introduce the differing cultural characteristics to the learner but also elucidate them as expressions of fundamental and universal humanity. In looking at behaviours or other expressions of the target culture, the learner must ask, as Seelye suggests (1974:26), what universal need the individual is trying to satisfy. On the other hand, approaches which emphasise cultural contrasts, especially isolated cultural facts, trivia and idiosyncracies, are more likely to foster stereotyping and ethnocentrism (cf. Lambert and Klineberg, 1967; Lambert, 1967:230). Such contrastive approaches emphasise the separateness of people of different cultures and lead to the notion of in-groups and out-groups (cf. Lambert, 1967:229) with the corollary that favourable cross-cultural attitudes and integrative motivation entail desire to identify with the other group and surrender one's former cultural allegiances.

A more appropriate notion in the multicultural society is that of retaining one's identity but broadening and making more flexible one's construction of reality and one's ability to accommodate others' differences and to place them within a coherent construct of what it is to be human. In this way, cross-cultural experience leads to the development of accommodating and favourable cross-cultural attitudes in general which precede rather than depend upon cultural knowledge which, however, they are ready to accommodate. This implies that the learner develops a sensitivity to cultural difference but retains a personal security of identity that permits him to be responsive and accommodating without being timid or vacillating (cf. Kleinjans, 1972:18). Adler describes the sort of person who might result:

> Multicultural man is the person who is intellectually and emotionally committed to the fundamental unity of all human beings while at the same time he recognises, legitimizes, accepts, and appreciates the fundamental differences that lie between people of different cultures ... multicultural man is recognised by the configuration of his outlooks and world view, by the way he incorporates the universe as a dynamically moving process, by the way he reflects the interconnectedness of life in his thoughts and his actions, and by the way he remains open to the imminence of experience.
>
> (Adler, 1974:24)

Experience in this context implies interaction with other cultural communities and emphasises the essential role of language learning as the component of multicultural education that most effectively promotes that interaction.

IV The Place of Language

It has been argued that culture learning must entail affective learning and affective change and that language learning has an essential role to play in effecting such change. In addition, language learning entails culture learning since a language cannot exist or be meaningful in isolation from its culture and, in turn, a culture cannot be fully understood apart from the language which helps to delineate its structure. Halliday describes culture as "a semiotic system, a system of meanings or information that is encoded in the behaviour potential of the members" and includes, is realised in, and is transmitted from person to person and generation to generation through, the language (cf. Halliday, 1974:4; 1975:36, 121). It is language which turns the human organism into a social being (Halliday, 1974:7). Thus, language and the culture or social context are closely integrated and interdependent, each reflects the structure of the other, and one cannot exist or be learned without the other (cf. 1974:120, 131-132). Similarly, Brown (1965:247) describes language learning as cognitive socialization, a process in which the learner "takes on" a culture and learning to use a language involves learning to manipulate the culture or aspects of it.

The importance of seeing language learning as culture learning is increased if the purpose of learning a language is to learn to communicate. Thus, for instance, using a language for communication implies interacting with speakers of the language and if the learner is to do this with confidence, he must be able to conform to the behavioural expectations of the other culture at least to the extent

that he does not jar unduly those with whom he wishes to communicate (cf. Rivers, 1975:3). He must know the conventions of interaction just as he must know what it is culturally appropriate to communicate about and what the meanings are that he is exchanging and assuming. Only then can the L_2, like his L_1, be a real language, viz., a tool by which he can make the society work for himself (cf. Le Page, 1975:140). Savignon (1972:55-56), for instance, found that, though linguistic competence was not affected by culture learning, communicative competence was. If learning a language implies learning to think in that language, then the learning of culture (i.e., the ways of thinking, believing, feeling and acting of a people (cf. Kleinjans, 1972:16)) is an essential part of language learning. Thus, it is necessary to see and teach language in its total social, situational and cultural context (cf. Saville-Troike 1974:1) and language teaching and culture teaching must be fully integrated.

Furthermore, people identify closely with their language, with the language which, in fact, structures their thought and expression. On one level, this is reflected in the perpetual development of teenage jargon which serves to mark one generation out from another at an age when personal and group identity assume considerable importance. On another level, it is reflected in the language riots that have occurred in India and elsewhere when attempts to impose a language on a people have been made. Thus, it is impossible to speak of multiculturalism without also meaning multilingualism and any adequate discussion of multiculturalism as a pattern for society or as a factor in influencing the curriculum of the society's education system must carefully consider the role of language.

Three tasks particularly pertinent to second language teaching emerge when one considers the re-structuring of education to meet

the needs of a multicultural society. First, second language skills to enable ready communication between individuals, generations and groups for family, social, business, educational and political purposes are essential. Second, the task for the education system as the transmitter of the community's culture and life-style becomes more complex. There will, for example, be a greater variety of customs, beliefs, arts, languages, and life-styles to teach. Furthermore, if there is to be one nation rather than numerous, fragmented, introspective, or even fearful and antagnostic ethnic groups, all the communities must be able to co-exist as equals, with equal rights and responsibilities. In addition, no living culture is static but is in a constant process of evolution and change. In Australia, it is desirable that the Australian culture, as it evolves, should be able to draw on all the resources that are available to it. The communities will be able to interact and contribute to each other, however, only when they can feel secure in themselves and their survival within the nation is not threatened. Thus, the second task for the education system is to ensure the security of the languages and cultures of Australia and to encourage interaction between the communities.

The third task for the education system is fundamental to both the first two. The education system must develop in its students cross-cultural attitudes favourable to life in the multicultural society: attitudes such as openmindedness, a lively and sensitive interest in racial and cultural difference, tolerance, acceptance of the rights of others to be different, empathy to enable the individual to understand and identify across cultural differences and to accept where he does not understand, and the ability to accept and identify with others as Australian even when ancestral linguistic and cultural traditions are different.

This last task, viz., the role of language teaching in promoting favourable cross-cultural attitudes warrants further consideration. It has already been argued that second language learning is an essential component in culture learning and, through that, may influence attitudes. In addition, Lambert (1969:295) reports considerably more favourable attitudes towards both communities in bilingual compared with monolingual children (cf. also Lambert, 1967:228; Lambert et al., 1968:476). He suggests (1967:230) that this is because the bilingual child learns that differences amongst national and cultural groups are not clear-cut and that the basic human similarities are more prominent. Lambert and Tucker (1972:177) also conclude that "other-culture sensitivity" has to be linked with the goal of bilingualism. Savignon (1972:18, 46, 58), in a study noted earlier, found that learning a second language (by whatever methods) led to a significant decrease in ethnocentrism.

Language learning also promotes favourable attitude development by providing a means by which the learner can escape beyond the limitations of his own culture to experience at first hand what it is to belong to another culture, to see the world through other eyes, and to be a foreigner in that culture. It gives the opportunity to view the prejudices engrained in his own language and culture from a different vantage point letting him more rapidly perceive his own unconsciously socialized prejudices (as, for example, in the evaluative use of "black" and "white" (cf. Milner, 1975:62-63, 67)). Such views have clear implications for methodology and underline the importance of moving the learner into the other language and culture rather than stand him outside to detachedly examine it. In particular, recent approaches adopted at Mount Gravatt C.A.E. and in the "on-arrival" migrant English programme in Australia require the learner

to make contact and interact with native speakers of the language and so help to break down the barriers around his understanding. Rivers has well expressed this role for language teaching:

> As students act out the role of the foreigner, trying to use his language as he would use it and see things as he would see them, reading what he would read, they are able to identify with him in a way which is not possible in a course in social studies or comparative literature in translation. This experience opens the door to a deeper understanding of another culture and a wider tolerance of different ideas and patterns of behaviour.
>
> (Rivers, 1968:26)

Nevertheless, there is no inevitable relationship between language learning and favourable cross-cultural attitudes though Alatis's (1975) comment seems likely: language learning does not automatically bring understanding but, given good will, it makes understanding more likely; given indifference, it makes good will more likely to arise. If such ideals are to be attained, favourable cross-cultural attitudes must be envisaged as conscious objectives and strategies to attain them must be incorporated in the teaching methods. In particular, the pre-eminent factor in developing favourable cross-cultural attitudes seems to be interaction since, as we saw earlier, the learner must come to see the people of the other culture as ordinary people instead of as stereotypes or caricatures. In particular, if we are to see people not "as mere quanta of humanity"

(Halliday, 1974:3) but as individuals like ourselves with whom we can have personal dealings, we must meet them as equal, fellow beings. It would seem likely that the best way to gain such an appreciation and decrease ethnocentrism (whether manifested in negative or exaggeratedly positive prejudice) would be to have contact with them in the same way that the learner has contact with people of his own culture.

However, some studies suggest that, initially, interaction may lead to less favourable attitudes, perhaps because of culture shock. This perhaps accounts for the "sharp drop in integrative motivation" that the "communicative skills" group in Savignon's study experienced (1972:60). In this group, though interaction occurred less, most emphasis fell on practising communicative acts with particular attention to the kinesic features of communication, i.e., learning to act like Frenchmen (cf. 1972:20). In other words, the emphasis was not so much on learning to recognise and accept other-culture characteristics as on making them one's own. In addition, the apparently less favourable attitudes that emerged are probably attributable either to a lack of confidence by the students in their new roles (cf. 1972:60) or to a more realistic view of the other people, i.e., the initial effect of the course was to diminish the superficial idealization and (positive) stereotyping of the other culture that result from many traditional culture courses and are no less unrealistic than prejudice. Once the initial "culture shock" of interaction and trying to perceive and act like the other group has passed, one might expect that more favourable attitudes would again emerge and this, Savignon found (1972:60), is what did happen.

In fact, some form of culture shock seems to be an essential pre-requisite to attitude change. Schumann has defined culture shock

as "anxiety resulting from the disorientation encountered upon entering a new culture" (Schumann, 1975:12). It occurs because a person entering a new culture brings with him certain expectations, presuppositions, ways of viewing the world, and problem-solving techniques but he finds that they do not "fit" in the new culture and this brings anxiety, fear and often a rejection of the other culture as irrational or inferior (cf. Schumann, 1975:12; Goodenough 1963:273). The development of favourable and accepting attitudes necessitates that the individual be aware of these often unconscious factors that determine his attitudes. This can come probably only as a result of a crisis or confrontation situation and thus it is not surprising that, following interaction, attitudes might seem to become less favourable. Their subsequent favourable development is likely to be more soundly based, balanced, and enduring than the attitudes of persons whose deep-set values, pre-suppositions, or prejudices have not been challenged (cf. Peck and Whitlow, 1975:45). In addition, when they consciously realise the deep-seated factors that determine attitudinal responses in any situation, people are more likely to be sensitive to and able to anticipate and avoid intercultural misunderstandings (cf. Seelye, 1974:84).

Expressed differently, the learner needs to realise the largely indifferent, neutral and fortuitous nature of his own culture and value systems, the consequent inappropriateness of cross-cultural value judgements, and the biasses that his own system imposes on him as he looks outside at other systems. This can come as the learner is transferred into another system, as using an L_2 in interaction can achieve. However, the resultant confrontation with the deep-seated determinants of his values and behaviour will be successfully negotiated only if the interaction goes on long enough for its effect to do more than make the suppressed prejudices overt and articulate

(consider Savignon 1972:60). What seems to be required is a thorough confrontation of the issues of race or cross-cultural relations plus significant experience of interacting in another culture. Freire also considers these two ways of understanding (essentially, conscious knowledge and experience or praxis) but stresses their close interweaving and the importance of their coming together at some point:

> We do not mean to suggest that critical knowledge of man-world relationships arises as a verbal knowledge outside of praxis ... The relationship between the theoretical context, in which codified representations of objective facts are analysed, and the concrete context, where these facts occur, has to be made real. (Freire, 1970:36)

Elsewhere, Freire says that the individual must confront reality critically, simultaneously objectifying it and acting upon it (Freire, 1970a:28).

Despite these arguments for an interactive approach to language learning for attitude change, intuitively and from introspection, it would seem that fear of being unable to communicate adequately or without errors may make the language learner nervous about becoming involved with L_2 speakers and this may generalise to a rejection of them. Oral practice as occurs in traditional language classrooms is insufficiently important to prove to the learner that he can communicate. In social interaction, the very existence of the individual as a social being is at stake and success in those circumstances proves communicative ability and identifies the learner as a bi- (or multi-) lingual being able to reach out into another society and

establish himself in it (cf. Savignon, 1972:3). He is then more likely to attempt to do so and to be favourably disposed to the people he reaches out to. Thus, experiences that show the learner that he can, after all, communicate with L_2 speakers will themselves be agreeable and this is also likely to generalise to a more favourable attitude to native speakers at the same time as promoting and encouraging communicative competence (see Ingram, in press).

We have already observed that knowledge about another culture is not sufficient to develop favourable cross-cultural attitudes. The very nature of what it is to be a person of another culture explains why this is so and why interaction is important. One's way-of-life, ideas, expectations, and perception of the world are continually influenced by one's total experience, by all those impinging aspects of one's culture, and by one's reflection upon them (cf. Freire, 1970:53). It is impossible in the time available in any class to cover all aspects of a culture. Even if it were possible, formal discussion necessarily isolates one area or one characteristic at any one time. Thus, traditionally, teachers of culture have, at best, chosen one path, e.g., classical literature or folklore (Seelye, 1974:18), by which to gain access to a culture. However useful such an approach may be in providing information, it necessarily exaggerates the salience of the characteristic under discussion and may over-generalise its applicability. Hence, it may produce further stereotyping especially since it tends to play down the individual selection amongst the culture's characteristics and options that produces individuality within a community. The only way that this can be overcome and a balanced perception gained is by the learner's experiencing the total culture, experiencing as far as possible all those cultural factors that impinge on a person in that culture by

directly experiencing what it is to live in it. In addition, the sheer size and complexity of what is to be absorbed precludes the learner with necessarily limited experience from fully acquiring the L_2 model of the world but it is the resultant differing expectations that lead to conflict and misunderstanding. The need, then, is for each person to become accustomed to such differences, to tolerate them, and to learn to handle situations in which they occur. This can come only from experience of such situations.

Within his own identity group, each person recognises, tolerates, and often applauds differences (e.g., hair colour and style or clothing) and, from this standpoint, the development of favourable cross-cultural or racial attitudes involves extending the individual's willingness to accept differences without imposing his own culture's values and behavioural expectations (cf. Goodenough, 1963:106); it involves extending the individual's parameters of judgement, extending the group with which he identifies. As Halliday notes (1974:9-10), it is "critically", if not "wholly", through language that he achieves this. The "human being" becomes one of a group of "people" with a certain personality and status largely through "linguistic interchange" with the group. Thus, interaction in the L_2 with other people can help him to extend and change the parameters of his identity system to include people of other cultures and to open his identity system formerly closed around unicultural parameters to allow him to tolerate other-culture differences. it enables him within this larger (and ever-increasing) group to establish his own social role (cf. Halliday, 1974:10, 13) and his larger group identity. Freire (1970a:135) suggests that the individual finds his identity in contrast with others but that the two ("I" and "thou") must come together in order to transform the world (see also Buber, 1961:Ch.II).

His dialogical theory of action stresses co-operation which can come only through communication or interaction (Freire, 1970a:135-136; cf. Milner, 1975:88). If this is considered in terms of social change in the multicultural society, then "communion with the L_2 people" is seen to be essential and "conscientization" occurs as people reflect and act together to achieve maximum understanding of reality, their relationships to it, and the actions needed to improve it (cf. Freire, 1970:75). Interaction is, clearly, a desirable means to cross-cultural understanding and balanced attitudinal development. For language learners in a multicultural society, it takes the form of involvement in the community.

V. Language Teaching Methods

In this paper, it is not possible to elaborate on the methods that are desirable if community language teaching is to meet the needs of multiculturalism though it has been discussed at some length elsewhere (e.g., Ingram, 1979a, 1976, in press). The desirable approach centres around community involvement as the central and integrating factor and requires that learners interact with native speakers who live in their society. Practical communication skills are developed through functional-notional approaches to course design and active methods emphasising such techniques as role play and extensive reading and listening and involving much active use of the language. The learner is continually placed in situations both in and out of the classroom where he must use the language to communicate. Some attention is also paid to formal grammatical teaching in response to felt need. Such approaches are well in accord with the major developments in language teaching occurring world-wide (especially those emanating from the Council of Europe) and have been used successfully in a variety of programmes in Australia. At Mount Gravatt

C.A.E., for example, community involvement approaches have been used with considerable success in First Year French courses (see Ingram, in press). In addition, they have been used throughout the "on-arrival" adult migrant English programme, with teachers reporting considerable success as reflected in increased learner confidence, communicative proficiency, and improved attitudes both on the part of the learners and the Australians with whom they interact.

VI. The Future

VI.1 National Language Policy

This paper has argued that language learning, especially community language learning, has a fundamental role to play in the education of all citizens in a multicultural society. However, the national survey of language teaching provided earlier makes it clear that that role is not being fulfilled and that the education system is not, in fact, catering for the needs arising from the multicultural nature of Australia's society. Despite the idealistic, if incipient, policy expressions referred to earlier, it is clear that, in most States, language teaching is being allowed to decline. It will continue to do so until those diverse expressions are realised in comprehensive and co-ordinated policies and implemented in educational practice. In other words, language teaching will not provide the vital basis for multicultural education that it can and must provide if multiculturalism is to become a reality unless Australia develops a national language policy and a national language education policy. Such policies have already been argued for in papers published elsewhere (e.g., Ingram, 1979) and those arguments will not be repeated here. Let me observe, however, that nowhere in the world where language skills are valued and language teaching is secure is the decision whether or not languages are to be learned and the nation's linguistic

resources conserved left to the inexperience, the immature consideration, and the restricted social understanding of children and adolescents. Rather, if community languages are to survive and if language learning is to take place, educational decision-makers at every level, principals, administrators, tertiary institutions, and politicians, must accept their responsibility to devise and implement appropriate policies and, in turn, ensure by legislation or regulation that languages are offered in all schools and that all students are obliged or, at the very least, strongly encouraged to undertake language study. Fishman (1980) has shown that languages will survive only if they receive strong, institutionalized support. In the United States, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies observed that languages

> ... as a key to unlock the mysteries of other customs and cultures, can no longer be viewed as an educational or civic luxury
> (Perkins, 1979:458)

and it went on to urge that language study be made compulsory at all levels of education. Similarly, in most European, African and Asian countries, policy decisions have been taken by politicians and educationalists alike which result in all students learning at least a second or a third language.

For Australia, the implications are clear: if we are serious about multiculturalism, policy decisions and viable implementation practices must replace empty words. In fact, if Australia fails to take the action necessary to provide a viable community language teaching system, it is in breach of its own laws and of a number of international conventions to which it is a signatory. Thus, for

example, if language is a part of ethnicity, the educational discrimination that results from children not receiving tuition in their first language and the employment discrimination that results from Australians being denied jobs by virtue of the language they speak are both contrary at least to the intent of Australia's own Racial Discrimination Act 1975 and to the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. The former, for example, expressly outlaws in Clause 9(1):

> ... any act involving a distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of any human right or fundamental freedom in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.

Similarly, the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* which Australia is about to ratify guarantees to all persons the right of self-determination and social and cultural development irrespective of language and culture (see Articles 1 and 2). Article 27 of the Covenant affirms:

> In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right ... to enjoy their own culture ... or to use their own language.

Again, the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education which Australia signed over ten years ago guarantees each individual's

rights to his own language and culture. In brief, the action required is clear: a thorough language planning exercise must be undertaken, the role of languages in Australian society and the society's needs for language skills must be enunciated, and a national language policy and a national language education policy must be developed and realised in a comprehensive, efficient and effective language teaching system.

VI.2 The Future of Multiculturalism

The 1970's were marked in Australia by the emergence of multiculturalism. As we move from that decade, there are many who, because of the contrast between pious expressions and confused or inadequate action, are fearful that the initiatives of the 1970's will be lost or even destroyed. There are, in fact, some who have called for a halt to multiculturalism. Those people active in this area are only too aware of the strident calls from such racist organisations as the National Front, the League of Rights, or the Nazi Party. Yet, even academics have called for a moratorium on further developments at least until the present "confusion" over multiculturalism is resolved (see Bullivant 1979). Two points need to be made in response to such a proposition.

First, although it is clear that there are far-reaching administrative and policy-making issues to be confronted, any confusion there is exists only for the academic or for the expedient-seeking administrator who wishes to avoid the radical re-thinking and restructuring needed to make a largely monocultural and monolingual education system more relevant. For the parents in the Greek community wanting their chilren to learn of their culture, to learn to speak their language and, at the same time, to be able to "make it" in the existing system in Australia, multiculturalism is real and

meaningful because, whether or not they can verbally define it, they are living it and aspiring to it every day. For the parents in the Papuan community who give their children all the experiences that Australian urban life can offer but who also talk to their children of "their village", who teach them traditional skills, who take them back to the village regularly, and who teach them the village language, multiculturalism is again clear and defined: it is what they live. In other words, it is not the concept of multiculturalism that is confused but the ability of academics, teachers and administrators to grasp it that is lacking. Alternatively, as Bullivant suggests (1979), their confusion may be an expedient which allows them to maintain the status quo with its traditional power structures and to preserve their position as the decision-makers by rejecting the possibility that the parents might, in fact, know what they want for their children. In addition, much of the "confusion" that some academics and administrators see in the concept of multiculturalism may be simply a reflection of the diversity that is inherent in it. If the "confusion" is lost, so might well be the diversity and, hence, multiculturalism itself. In fact, seen in this light, multiculturalism is not exceptional but, rather, is a realisation of tenets educationalists have long espoused, viz., that education must reflect concern for the individual and that an education system should be flexible enough to accommodate individuality by providing varied opportunities and by being responsive to the needs of each individual as well as of the society as a whole. Furthermore, at least in the area of second language teaching, it cannot be claimed that changes have been withheld because there is insufficient information, inconclusive research data, or confusion. On the contrary, the needs are clear, the social attitudes are clear, and the curriculum theory and methodology are available. However, they are not drawn upon and, consequently,

the language teaching system, except for drastically reduced enrolments, continues effectively unchanged from 30, 50, or even 100 years ago. Yet administrators, at least in the Queensland school system, brush such observations aside, accuse teachers of inefficiency, perpetuate the established system, and leave to children to decide whether or not the nation's cultural and linguistic resources are to be preserved. The cause is not lack of information or confusion over multiculturalism: it seems rather to be a lack of will on the part of the education policy-makers to examine the real situation, to take rational decisions, to justify those decisions, and to have the courage to implement them. Thus, as we observed earlier, the Queensland policy on multiculturalism (Working Party on Multiculturalism 1978) advocates that the present ineffectual secondary school language system continue unchanged, rejects primary school language teaching, and reduces multiculturalism to a superficial tourist guidebook of cultural oddities and language phrases.

Secondly, the call for a moratorium on multiculturalism is both impractical and undesirable. With at least one quarter of the electors members of various "ethnic" communities, the political backlash from a moratorium would preclude any government's contemplating it. Furthermore, in discussing multiculturalism, we are not discussing a new "bandwaggon" or, as Bullivant says (1979), a new "educational ideological fashion". Rather, we are talking of the everyday lives of over one in four Australians, and, in fact, of all Australians. It is perhaps just possible for the cloistered academic or conservative and confused administrator to call for a moratorium. It is not possible, however, if you are a small Greek girl who says:

> I don't like Australian people that call you a wog, nick-names or make fun of you. You mind your own business, and without saying anything to them they'll call us a wog. I don't know why they hate us so much, because we are not that kind of people that swear or touch anyone or tease them without them doing or saying anything to us. Sometimes they would say to us: 'Why did you come to Australia for and not stay in your own wog country?' (Asian Bureau Australia, 1977:21)

It is not possible to call for a moratorium if you are an Aboriginal of good reputation who is refused entry to a nightclub or hotel solely because he is black. It is not possible to call for a moratorium if you are a parent or grandparent who sees the child she loves becoming progressively alienated from her. It is not possible if you are a highly qualified Vietnamese acacemic working as a gardener at a cement factory. Nor is it possible to call for a moratorium on educational developments to meet language needs if you are a Greek woman who has taught in ethnic schools for 15 years but whose lack of relevant English skills will ensure she fails the teacher education course she wants to complete. Nor is it possible to call for a moratorium on attitude change if you are a young Aboriginal girl handcuffed naked to a tree while a police officer violates her with his police baton.

Quoting such cases as these may seem an emotive way to discuss multiculturalism but all of these people are real persons with whom the writer has been involved within the last twelve months. When we speak

of multiculturalism, it is of people like that and thousands more, of whom we speak. It is too easy for academics and administrators to stand off remote from society and fail to see the individuals who are involved and their needs. A multicultural society is simply made up of many individuals with different backgrounds, languages, needs, aspirations and perceptions of the world. If we see only the mass and ignore the individuals and their emotions, then it is perhaps easy to brush aside or postpone our response to the challenge of multiculturalism. You cannot do so if you are one of the individuals at one of the inter-faces between cultures in the society.

VII. In Conclusion

In this paper, four factors have emerged of particular significance to multiculturalism and the future of community languages. First, a purely knowledge-based approach to multicultural education is inadequate and due account must be taken of values, attitudes and the affective aspects of the people. Second, learners must themselves experience other cultures and be encouraged to interact as equals with people of other cultures. Third, political and educational policy-makers must take account of the society's language needs, recognise that multiculturalism must entail multilingualism, accept that if cultures and languages are to survive they need institutional support, and then they must set out to devise policies and programmes that confront the reality of resources and needs. Fourth, and most centrally, language learning (especially community language learning) must be seen as an essential component of an education system designed to provide the skills, understandings and attitudes required to ensure an harmonious and equitable multicultural society.

Let me conclude by quoting three statements which sum up more clearly than all the learned argument one might put forward the

essence of what multiculturalism is about and what community language teaching can contribute to it. The first is by a Greek student who speaks of how his parents came to Australia and struggled to raise their children in a new land:

> Roots slowly untangled in the dark.
> The children are no longer children.
> We have left our first home
> and created our own:
> Other blood has come in.
> Other blood has been mixed.
> A new child
> a new creation
> a new beginning
> is expected.
> This child will have a proud and rich heritage
> One of deep suffering
> of silent knowing
> of broken bodies and minds
> of warm welcoming love.
> (Quoted in Asian Bureau Australia, 1977:27)

The second was written by an eight year old mixed-race Papuan Australian girl after spending a fortnight's holiday back in Papua:

> We stayed for two days in Port Moresby
> in middle-sized Paia Paia's house. It was
> a little house in Gerehu. It was pretty
> and ugly at the same time. At first it
> was ugly, when I first came, but after a
> while it became pretty.

That is the essence of multiculturalism: to realise that what is different we often reject as ugly but that, as one experiences new

ideas, new things, and new cultures, so they become acceptable or, at least, tolerable and as worthy of existence. This is an experience that cannot be taught but can be learned. Hence, finally, let us observe another statement by the French philosopher-writer, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry which well sums up much of the perspective on multiculturalism presented in this paper:

> Connaître, ce n'est point démontrer,
> ni expliquer. C'est accéder à la
> vision. Mais, pour voir, il
> convient d'abord de participer.
> Cela est dur apprentissage...
> (Saint-Exupéry, 1942:54)

To see, you must first participate but to fully see and fully participate you must speak the other community's language. For that reason, if Australia is at all genuine in its claims to want to foster multiculturalism, it must ensure that all children experience effective and successful second language teaching. Without a dramatic improvement in the language teaching situation, multiculturalism must remain a hypocritical and dangerous myth. With it, Australia is on the way to showing that people of different cultures and races can live together harmoniously and profit from each others' individuality.

FOOTNOTE

(1) Thanks are due to the departments or boards controlling secondary education in Western Australia, South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, Australian Capital Territory, and Queensland for supplying the language enrolment figures. No figures were forthcoming from New South Wales or the Northern Territory.

Adler, P.S.

1974 "Beyond Cultural Identity : Reflections upon Cultural and Multicultural Man". *Topics in Culture Learning*. Vol. 2; 23-40.

Alatis, J.E.

1975 "Teaching and Learning Foreign Languages - Why? A New Look at an Old Question". Paper to the Triennial Congress of FIPLV, Washington, D.C., 27-30 November .

Asian Bureau Australia

1977 *Walk in My Shoes*. Melbourne: Dove Publications.

Australian Ethnic Affairs Council

1977 *Australia as a Multicultural Society*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Bostock, W.

1973 "Monolingualism in Australia". In *The Australian Quarterly*, Vol. 45, No. 2; 39-52.

Brown, R.

1965 "Language and Categories". Appendix in Bruner et al.; 247-312.

Bruner, J.S., Goodnow, J. and Austin, G.A.

1956 *A Study of Thinking*. Rpt. New York: Science Education: 1965.

Buber, M.

1947 *Between Man and Man*. Tr. from the German by R.G. Smith. London: Fontana: 1961.

Bullivant, B.M.

1979 "The Challenge of Pluralism for Australian Education: Some Notes for a Seminar on the S.T.E.P.S. Report". Mimeograph.

Commonwealth Advisory Committee

1970 *The Teaching of Asian Languages and Cultures in Australia*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

Commonwealth Education Portfolio

1979 *Discussion Paper on Education in a Multicultural Australia.* Canberra: Commonwealth Education Department.

Department of Education

1976 *Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Dil, A.S. (ed.)

1972 *Language, Psychology and Culture: Essays by Wallace E. Lambert.* Stanford: University Press.

Dodge, J.W. (ed.)

1972 *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language-in-Culture, North-East Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1972.* Montpelier, Vermont: Capital City Press.

Fishman, J.A. (ed.)

1968 *Readings in the Sociology of Language.* The Hague: Mouton.

Fishman, J.A.

1980 "Bilingualism and Biculturism as Individual and as Societal Phenomena". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* Vol. 1, No. 1; 3-15.

Freire, P.

1970 *Cultural Action for Freedom.* Rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin: 1972.

Freire, P.

1970a *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin: 1972.

Goodenough, W.H.

1963 *Cooperation in Change.* New York: Russell Stage Foundation.

Halliday, M.A.K.

1974 *Language and Social Man.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K.

1975 *Learning How to Mean.* London: Edward Arnold.

Halsall, E.

1968 *French as a Second Language: Levels of Attainment in Three Countries.* Hull: University of Hull Institute of Education.

Ingram, D.E.

In Press. "To See, To Speak : Participate - Community Involvement in Language Teaching". *Unicorn.*

Ingram, D.E.

1980 "Community Attitudes to Language Learning in Schools". Paper to the Third National Languages Conference, University of Sydney, 23-27 August .

Ingram, D.E.

1979a "Aspects of Personality Development for Bilingualism". Paper to the 1979 RELC Seminar, Singapore, 16-21 April .

Ingram, D.E.

1979 "The Case for a National Language Policy in Australia". In *Babel,* Vol. 15, No. 1; 3-16.

Ingram, D.E.

1978 "Learning Through Use: A Projected Community-based Course for Tertiary Students of French". In Ingram and Quinn; 117-125.

Ingram, D.E. and Quinn, T.J.

1978 *Language Learning in Australian Society.* Melbourne: Australian International Press and Publications.

Jarvis, G.A.

1976 "The 200th Year : More Need than Ever Before for Foreign Language Study". In *Modern Language Journal,* Vol. LX, Nos. 5-6 (September-October); 240-247.

Johansson, S.G.

1975 "Report from the UNESCO-FIPLV Symposium on the Teaching of Languages to the Children of Immigrants, Munich, January 27th - February 1st, 1975". Mimeograph.

Keesing, R.M.

1974 "Theories of Culture". In *Siegel*; 73-97.

Kleinjans, E.

1972 *On Culture Learning*. Working Papers of the East-West Culture Learning Institute, No. 13 (January). Honolulu: East-West Center.

Lambert, W.E.

1967 "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism". *The Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 23, No. 2; 91-109. Rpt. in Dil 1972; 212-235.

Lambert, W.E.

1969 "Psychological Aspects of Motivation in Language Learning". *The Bulletin of the Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association*, May; 5-11. Rpt. in Dil 1972; 290-299.

Lambert, W.E., Gardner, R.C.

1968 "A Study of the Roles of Attitude and Motivation in Second Language Learning". In Fishman; 473-491.

Lambert, W.E. and Klineberg, O.

1967 *Children's Views of Foreign Peoples: A Cross-National Study*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lambert, W.E. and Tucker, G.R.

1972 *Bilingual Education of Children : The St. Lambert Experiment*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Le Page, R.B.

1975 "Sociolinguistics and the Problem of 'Competence'". *Language Teaching and Linguistics : Abstracts*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (July) ;137-156.

Martin, J.I.

1972 "Migrants: Equality and Ideology", Meredith Memorial Lecture, Melbourne.

Milner, D.

1975 *Children and Race*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Peck, D. and Whitlow, D.

1975 *Approaches to Personality Theory*. London: Methuen.

Perkins, J.A.

1979 "Report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies". *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 12, No. 6 (December); 457-464.

Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants (Galbally Report)

1978 *Migrant Services and Programs*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Rivers, W.

1968 *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. Chicago: University Press.

Rivers, W.

1975 "The Natural and the Normal in Language Learning". Harvard: mimeograph.

de Saint-Exupéry, A.

1942 *Pilote de Guerre*. Paris: Gallimard.

de Saint-Exupéry, A.

1958 *Le Petit Prince*. London: Heinemann.

Savignon, S.J.

1972 *Communicative Competence : An Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

Saville-Troike, M.

1974 "TESOL Today : the Need for New Directions". *TESOL Newsletter*, Vol. VIII, Nos. 5-6 (September-November); 1-2, 6.

Schools Commission

1978 *Report for the Triennium 1979-81*. Canberra: Schools Commission.

Schumann, J.H.

1975 "Second Language Acquisition Research: Getting a More Global Look at the Learner". Paper to the University of Michigan Sixth Annual Conference on Applied Linguistics. Ann Arbor: Michigan: 31 January -1 February , mimeograph.

Seelye, H.N.

1974 *Teaching Culture : Strategies for Foreign Language Educators*. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Company/ACTFL.

Siegel, B.J. (ed.)

1974 *Annual Review of Anthropology*. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews Inc.

Trifonovitch, G.J.

1973 "On Cross-Cultural Orientation Techniques". *Topics in Culture Learning*, Vol. 1; 38-47.

Tucker, G.R. and Lambert, W.E.

1972 "Sociocultural Aspects of Foreign-Language Study". In Dodge; 26-30.

Tuttle, H.G., Guitart, J., Papalia, A. and Zampogna, J.

1979 "Effects of Cultural Presentations on Attitudes of Foreign Language Students". *Modern Language Journal*, Vol. LXIII, No. 4 (April); 177-182.

Working Party on Languages and Linguistics

1975 *Languages and Linguistics in the Australian Universities : Report of the Working Party on Languages and Linguistics to the Universities Commission*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Working Party on Multicultural Education

1978 "Education for a Multicultural Society". Brisbane: Queensland Education Department: mimeograph.